| | Case 3:10-cv-00115-TEH Document 8 Filed 01/07/10 Page 1 of 2 |
|----|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 9 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 10 | SHANNON RILEY, |
| 11 | Petitioner, No. 2:09-cv-3336 JFM (HC) |
| 12 | vs. |
| 13 | CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND |
| 14 | REHABILITATION, et al., |
| 15 | Respondents. ORDER |
| 16 | / |
| 17 | Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of |
| 18 | habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, together with a request to proceed in forma |
| 19 | pauperis. In his application, petitioner challenges a prison disciplinary conviction that he |
| 20 | sustained while he was incarcerated at California Correctional Institution in Tehachapi, |
| 21 | California. Petitioner is now confined at Salinas Valley State Prison in Soledad, California. |
| 22 | By the instant action, petitioner challenges a prison administrative decision; |
| 23 | consequently, the instant petition is one for review of the execution of a sentence imposed by a |
| 24 | California state court. See White v. Lambert, 370 F.3d 1002, 1010-11 (9th Cir. 2004). As a |
| 25 | general rule, "[t]he proper forum to challenge the execution of a sentence is the district where the |
| 26 | prisoner is confined." <u>Dunne v. Henman</u> , 875 F.2d 244, 249 (9th Cir. 1989). Petitioner is |
| | 1 |

| 1 | incarcerated at Salinas Valley State Prison in Soledad, California. Soledad is in the County of |
|----|---|
| 2 | Monterey, which lies in the Northern District of California. See 28 U.S.C. § 84(a). In the |
| 3 | interest of justice, this court may transfer this action "to any other district where it might have |
| 4 | been brought." 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). Therefore, this action will be transferred to the United |
| 5 | States District Court for the Northern District of California. |
| 6 | In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: |
| 7 | 1. This court has not ruled on petitioner's motions to proceed in forma pauperis, |
| 8 | for appointment of counsel, or for evidentiary hearing; and |
| 9 | 2. This matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern |
| 10 | District of California. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d); 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). |
| 11 | DATED: January 6, 2010. |
| 12 | 10 7 100 01 |
| 13 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE |
| 14 | |
| 15 | 12/kly |
| 16 | rile3336.108 |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |